UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,559	09/15/2003	David Darden Chambliss	SJO920030006US1	3819
	7590 06/13/200 YNES & VICTOR, LL	EXAMINER		
ATTN: IBM37	,	GOODCHILD, WILLIAM J		
BEVERLY HIL	EVERLY DRIVE, SUI LLS, CA 90212	1E 210	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2145	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/13/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/663,559	CHAMBLISS ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

WIL	LIAM J. GOODCHILD	2145	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears of	on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 June 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICA	TION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the sapplication, applicant must timely file one of the following replication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (was for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1 periods:	s: (1) an amendment, affidavi ith appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisor no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). Of MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	y Action, or (2) the date set forth an SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on when the been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorte set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	n and the corresponding amount ned statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the AMENDMENTS 	thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but proposed (a) They raise new issues that would require further conside (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better forms.	ration and/or search (see NO	TE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a correse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. So Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	<u>_</u> .		
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) w 	•	•	_
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-15,17 and 18. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		n be entered and an ex	pianation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and suff was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a No- entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overce showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and	me <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10.		·	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but doe See Continuation Sheet.		n condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO 13. ☐ Other:	(SB/U8) Paper No(s)		
/Jason D Cardone/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145	William J Goodchild Examiner Art Unit: 2145		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: A - Applicant argues "the examiner has not cited any part of Ng or Guha that teaches or suggests that a virtualization controller, which maps physical storage resources to virtual volumes, gathers I/O performance data and transmits the gathered performance data to a service level agreement server".

- Å Guha discloses gathering I/O performance data [Guha, paragraph 45], Ng discloses a virtualization controller mapping physical storeage resources to virtual volumes [Ng, paragraphs 2 and 34] and collecting I/O data [Ng, paragraphs 23 and 43].
- B Applicant argues "the Examiner has not cited any part of Ng or Guha that teaches or suggests the claim requirement that a service level agreement server transmits commands to the virtualization controller to throttle I/O transmission over the I/O paths if the performance data for the requests does not satisfy the performance criteria."
- B Guha discloses based on traffic levels observed and communicated by the QoS Enforcer to the content controller, additional resources at the server and storage levels can be resassigned in the content pool to improve I/O access and the SLA needs of the content requests [Guha, paragraph 69]. Ng discloses the virtualization controller which can perform duties of I/O monitoring and providing flow control [Ng, paragraphs 23 and 43].
- C Applicant argues "there is no teaching that the content controller determines whether the requests sent through the QoS enforcer satisfy a performance criteria and sends commands to the QoS enforcer to throttle I/O transaction if the performance criteria is not satisfied".
- C Guha discloses based on traffic levels observed and communicated by the QoS Enforcer to the content controller, additional resources at the server and storage levels can be resassigned in the content pool to improve I/O access and the SLA needs of the content requests [Guha, paragraph 69].